



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/489,629	01/24/2000	Richard H. Lamb	201385 6064	
7:	590 07/15/2003			
Phillip M Pippenger Leydig Voit & Mayer Ltd Two Prudential Plaza Suite 4900			EXAMINER	
			VU, THONG H	
180 North Stets Chicago, IL 6			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
o 			2142	Co
			DATE MAILED: 07/15/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Pre			
3-	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/489,629	LAMB ET AL.				
·	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Thong H Vu	2142				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 09 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate or the final originally set in the final	opriate extension Office action; or			
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. 						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: see		dered but does NO	T place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly			
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• • •		and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-33.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
D. ☐ Other:						
			i			

Application/Control Number: 09/489,629

Art Unit: 2142

Response to Arguments

Page 2

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/9/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive to overcome the prior art.

2. Applicant argues the prior art did not teach (c) receving a response from access control web server.

Examiner notes the prior art taught the origin server (or access control Web server) obtain a copy of the request object and forwarded to the client by proxy cache [Cohen col 7 lines 11-35]

3. Applicant argues the prior art did not teach (d) control access.

Examiner notes the prior art taught a large ISP control its proxy caches a client request is directed [Cohen col 1 lines 24-43]; connection control block [Cohen col 8 line 59-col 9line 17]; program control and dedicated logic [Cohen col 17 lines 42-63].

4. Claims 17 and 33 contain the similar limitations set forth of claim 1. Therefore, claims 17, 33 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 1.

Thus, the rejection is sustained.

M

MARK POWELL
PATENT EXAMINER
PROLOGY CENTER 2100